

Division of Capital Asset Management Designer Evaluation Forms

The Designer Evaluation forms are required by Section 13 of Chapter 159 of the Acts of 2000 which amends Section 38E of Chapter 7. As of November 1, 2000, all DCAM Project Managers (as well as all Public Agencies using State funding) must complete the Standard Designer Evaluation Form.

- The Standard Designer Evaluation form has been established for use by DCAM as a Microsoft Access Database. It is linked to the MMARS system and will allow reference only to established projects and contracted Designers.
- Public Agencies other than DCAM who are required to submit the Evaluation forms will submit them by mail to the Designer Selection Board and to DCAM. Designer Evaluations submitted by Public Agencies will not be a part of the DCAM database, but they will be available for reference by DCAM project managers only from either the Office of Programming or the Designer Selection Board.
- The DCAM Designer Evaluation procedures are outlined below. These procedures exceed the requirements of the legislation, but are required by DCAM policy to ensure good communications with the Designers throughout the life of the project.

Procedures:

1. At the completion of the project stages of **Study Program Submission(S3), Study Completion (S10), Schematic Design (B1), Design Development (B4), Construction Documents (C9), 60% of Construction (D60) and Construction Substantial Completion (E-1)**, the Project Manager (PM) will set up the Designer Evaluation form in the Microsoft Access Database. A section of the central, or project file must be designated for the hard copy of the Designer Evaluation form. At the initiation of a project, all project managers should provide a copy of the evaluation forms to Designers (they will be incorporated into Form 9) and note that they will be evaluated according to the categories noted on the forms. Design/Build projects will not require a Designer Evaluation as the Division does not hold a contract with the Designer for these projects. Designer Evaluations must be completed for all projects that are currently contracted, but not yet completed. At the next relevant milestone of the project (as noted above) PM's must complete the Designer Evaluation form.
2. The PM is responsible for completing and signing the evaluation forms and obtaining input from all relevant parties and reviewers at the completion of each stage. Any member of DCAM staff who worked directly with the designers should be consulted to ensure that the evaluation is reflective of their performance on all aspects of the project. The evaluation should be independent and fair, based only on the specific project for which the evaluation is being completed. Each form must be reviewed and initialed by the appropriate supervisor: Deputy Director of Construction Services as well as the Deputy Commissioner; or the Director of Programming (depending on the stage). Any changes to the evaluation must be recorded in the database so that the signed hard copy maintained in the file is the same as that in the database.
3. Each Evaluation at the various stages must be completed by the PM, reviewed and signed by the appropriate supervisor as noted above, and then transmitted to the Designer within 2 weeks of the completion of that stage of the project.
4. The Designer will have the opportunity to submit a written response to DCAM and to the Designer Selection Board disputing any information contained in the form and setting forth any additional information concerning the building project or the oversight of the building construction contract by

the DCAM as may be relevant to the evaluation of the designer's performance on the contract. Any such letter must be attached to the evaluation form for inclusion in the designer's file. The Database will indicate that a Designer's reply has been received, but a copy of the reply will be stored only as hard copy in the Designer's file at DCAM and with the Designer Selection Board.

5. The completed Evaluation forms **from the Final stage of the Project** and any **Designer's reply** must be maintained as hard copy in the project file and forwarded by the PM to the Designer Selection Board for inclusion in the Designer's Qualification File. The Final stages are defined as follows:

For Study:

Study Final Completion (S10)

For Design:

Construction Documents (C9)

For Construction Administration:

Construction Substantial Completion (E1)

6. The information in the Designer's Qualification File including the completed evaluation forms will be made available to Public Agencies, only upon request to the Designer Selection Board or to the Division of Capital Asset Management. Access to the final and interim evaluations within the DCAM database will be available for viewing only by DCAM project Managers.
7. The Evaluation information contained in the Designer's Qualification File will be provided to the Designer Selection Board through a standard format (in the application Matrix completed by DCAM project managers) for each application process. Applicants should not reference their Evaluations in their application.
8. Please note that the new legislation provides special coverage for State employees in the event that a Designer files suit against an employee who completed an Evaluation form. The public employee is ensured of legal representation by the Commonwealth, if sued, and the State will indemnify the employee from all personal financial losses and expenses including, but not limited to, legal fees and filing costs, if any, in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000. If the employee is found to have acted in a "willful, wanton or reckless manner", by the courts, the State will still cover legal fees and filing costs, but not damages.
9. The new legal coverage, together with the approach of completing evaluations at several stages of the project, are intended to ensure honest and constructive feedback in the evaluation forms. PM's are encouraged to discuss any concerns about the Evaluation Forms with the Deputy Director or Director.

Instructions for Completion of Consultant Evaluation Form**Purpose**

The purpose of this form is to fulfill the mandate of the law (Section 13 of chapter 159 of the Acts of 2000 which amends Section 38E of chapter 7) which requires this agency to evaluate the performance of Designers and to facilitate communication between the agency and our consultants on an on-going basis.

Responsibility

Responsibility for completing the evaluation forms rests with the Project Manager (PM), as does the obligation to obtain input from relevant project participants including, but not limited to, Client Agency Representatives, Energy Team Specialists, Project Engineers and Users. The evaluation is intended to be objective, independent and fair. Refer to the **Procedures** outlined above for full details.

Process

At the completion of the appropriate project milestone, the PM will set up the Consultant Evaluation form in the Microsoft Access Database. Evaluation Forms are to be completed at several stages of the Design and Construction Process with the intention of providing the consultant with opportunities for corrective action to be taken prior to the completion of the project. The Consultant Evaluation Form must be completed by the PM and reviewed by the Deputy Director (OCS) or Director (PRO) within two weeks of the official completion date of each of the following project phases:

- **Study:** 1. Program Submission (S-3), 2. Study Completion (S-10)
- **Design:** 1. Design Schematic Submission B1), 2. Design Development Submission (B4)
3. Construction Documents Submission (C9)

Rating/Scoring

The rating for each category should be based on overall performance, but specific issues and problems can be noted through remarks annotated at the relevant category. The more detailed and constructive criticism, the more opportunity for the Consultant to respond and improve. Ratings should be entered in whole numbers (integers 1, 2, 3 or 4) only. The score will be calculated by the database form, automatically, and the weighting is based on the relative importance of the various responsibilities. A score of 1 indicates dissatisfactory performance and must be accompanied by detailed description of areas in need of improvement.

Indicate the project phase that has just been completed, note that Construction Administration utilizes a different form. All questions have relevance to each of the design phases of a project. Where a specific bulleted question does not apply, consider the overall numbered question.

- Question #1** This question addresses the Designer's ability to understand and interpret the design and program requirements of the project. It has the most relevance during the Study and early design phases, but should be evaluated even at CD's to be certain that the stated program/design requirements are carried throughout the entire development of the project.
- Question #2** The Designer has a responsibility to be mindful of the established budget limitations through all project phases. This question evaluates their attention to the budget including overseeing the work of the Cost Estimator and other consultants.
- Question #3** The Designer has a leadership role in the project to ensure overall communication and documentation as well as management and review of all sub-consultants' work. This section evaluates their ability to provide that leadership and review, as well as the quality of the documentation. If there was a problem with the performance of a subconsultant, it is ultimately the Designer's responsibility to resolve the issues – this is the section in which to document that situation. As a means to tracking dissatisfactory sub-consultant performance, be sure to indicate the name of any relevant subconsultants and describe the nature of the problems.
- Question #4** This question evaluates the Designer's technical expertise and their ability to communicate issues and facilitate resolution in a timely manner.
- Question #5** This question should document the ability of the Designer to maintain the schedule (where under their control) and provide appropriate and consistent staffing for the project. Was the Designer reasonable and responsible in their interpretation of the project scope, or did they consistently request additional services for work that was clearly within the contract scope?
- Question #6** Regulatory and permitting issues can have a major impact on project schedules, design and costs. Attention to these issues must be paid throughout the duration of the design process. This question documents the designer's leadership and technical capability in this area.
- Question #7** This question evaluates the quality of the Designer's communications from memos and meeting minutes to contract drawings and specifications. In phases where no contract documents are produced, evaluate the quality of the progress drawings, presentation materials or other communications and submissions. Did the Designer incorporate the comments and respond to the feedback received from all parties during the design process?

The total rating will be automatically tallied by the database form. PM's are encouraged to add remarks to elaborate on the ratings and to provide additional feedback to the consultants.

DCAM Designer Performance Evaluation Form**Design Phase**

Study/Final Design Consultant: _____ Date Completed: _____

Project Title: _____

Project #: _____ User Agency: _____

Project Manager: _____

Deputy Director (OCS): _____ Date: _____

Director (PRO): _____ Date _____

Phase _____

Performance Rating Scale:

**1. Designer's responsiveness to Capital Asset Management and User Agency design and program criteria.**

- Did the Designer incorporate the articulated goals and criteria of the design program?
- Did the Designer analyze, interpret and discuss suggestions and issues in a professional manner?
- Did the Designer actively participate in meeting discussions?
- Did the Designer follow through on decisions made at meetings and respond to reviewer comments?
- Did the Designer work well with the User Agency, Energy team or others?

_____	X.10=	_____
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

2. Designer's adherence to established project budget limitations.

- Was the Designer responsive to the established budget?
- Did the Designer work creatively to achieve the program goals within the existing budget?

_____	X.10=	_____
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

3. Designer's ability to effectively manage the project team and relay information to its consultants and personnel.

- Did the Designer keep the team members informed of issues?
- Did the Designer effectively use the project team members as informational resources?
- Did the Designer adequately review subconsultants' work prior to submittals for review approval?

_____	X.05=	_____
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

4. Designer's ability to solve technical/design problems .

- Did the Designer address design constraints and take advantage of design opportunities?
- Did the Designer identify design problems in a timely manner?
- Did the Designer propose design alternatives and articulate their advantages/disadvantages?
- Was the Designer able to balance technical issues and aesthetics issues?

_____	X.15=	_____
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

5. Designer's ability to submit complete design/study packages within the established project specific schedules and fee.

- Did the Designer prepare submittals in accordance with the agreed upon schedule?
- Where the submittals complete?
- Did the Designer alert the Project Manager to possible schedule problems in advance of delays?
- Did the Designer staff the project appropriately and in keeping with their original application?
- Did the Designer make requests for additional services fees for work that was within the scope of the contract?

	X.25=	
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

6. Designer's ability to manage its responsibilities in the regulatory/approvals process.

- Did the Designer adequately research and document building code and life safety/accessibility issues?
- Did the Designer pay adequate attention to regulatory restrictions during the design process?
- Did the Designer make timely submittals of permit applications materials?
- Did the Designer assist the Project Team in understanding codes/regulations and their implications?

	X.10=	
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

7. Quality of the Study Report/Progress/Design/Contract Documents.

- Were the materials submitted complete in all respects?
- Was the writing style/presentation clear and straightforward with adequate back-up?
- Were all comments and review requests adequately incorporated into the report/documents?
- Were the contract documents sufficiently clear and complete that no addenda or only minor addenda had to be issued?
- Were the contract documents well coordinated?
- Was the Designer thorough and consistent in its use of graphic symbols and terminology ?

	X.25=	
Rating		Score

Comments: _____

Total Rating

--

Remarks: (each question will have a separate remarks section in the database)

Total Score

Overall Comments: _____
